



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,655	06/27/2001	Masahide Mohri	Q51805	4405

7590 09/23/2002  
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

BOS, STEVEN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1754

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2002

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/891,655

Applicant(s)  
Mohri et al

Examiner  
Steven Bos

Art Unit  
1754



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 5, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-28, and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-28, and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,4-6,11-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jodden '163.

Jodden teaches the claimed process of calcining titanium oxide or precursor thereof in an atmosphere of chlorine gas (see the examples and claims). Since Jodden teaches the instantly claimed process the instantly claimed product would also necessarily be formed.

The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the portion of the prior art's range which is within the range of applicant's claims because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, see *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the overlapping portion of the range disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness, *In re Malagari*, 182 USPQ 549.

Art Unit: 1754

Claims 1,4-8,11-28,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pastor '656.

Pastor teaches the instantly claimed process of calcining metal oxide powders in an atmosphere of halogen gas (see the examples and claims). Since Pastor teaches the instantly claimed process the instantly claimed product would also necessarily be formed.

The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the portion of the prior art's range which is within the range of applicant's claims because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, see *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the overlapping portion of the range disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness, *In re Malagari*, 182 USPQ 549.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

Serial Number: 09/891655

4

Art Unit: 1754

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1,4-28,31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6303091. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they overlap in scope of subject matter claimed. It would have been obvious to recover the instantly claimed product from the taught process.

Claims 1,4-28,31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 5736111. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Art Unit: 1754

they overlap in scope claimed. It would have been obvious to recover the instantly claimed product from the taught process.

Claims 1,4-28,31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 5688480. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they overlap in scope of subject matter claimed. It would have been obvious to recover the instantly claimed product from the taught process.

Claims 1,4-28,31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 5840267. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they overlap in scope of subject matter claimed. It would have been obvious to recover the instantly claimed product from the taught process.

Claims 1,4-28,31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 5846505. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they overlap in scope of subject matter claimed. It would have been obvious to recover the instantly claimed product from the taught process.

Applicant's arguments filed August 5, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states that the present invention does not require a raw material containing titanium oxide and a relatively large amount of iron as used in the examples of Jodden.

However the instant claims do not exclude the presence of iron.

Applicant states that Jodden teaches a larger particle size of raw material than that instantly used.

However the instant process claims are not so limited. The process taught by Jodden still appears to be substantially identical to the process instantly claimed and therefore would produce the instantly claimed product, absent a comparative showing otherwise. See *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430.

Applicant states that Pastor does not describe titanium oxide, zirconium oxide or precursors thereof in the examples or claims.

However the examples expressly teach the instantly claimed process of calcining, ie. heating at 1000°C, a non alpha alumina powder, eg. silica, germanium dioxide, lanthanum oxide, etc., in molecular halogen, eg. chlorine, which would produce the instantly claimed product, absent a comparative showing otherwise.

Applicant states that all of the claims of the references used in the ODP are method claims in contrast to the instant product claims and the examiner has not set forth any basis for asserting

Serial Number: 09/891655

7

Art Unit: 1754

that the embodiment of the present claimed invention relating to the powder would have been prima facie obvious from the claims of the cited references.

However each of the ODP references teaches the instantly claimed process which would prima facie obviously produce the instantly claimed product, absent a comparative showing otherwise.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Bos whose telephone number is (703) 308-2537. The examiner is on



Serial Number: 09/891655

8

Art Unit: 1754

the increased flexitime program schedule. The FAX No. for After Final amendments is 703-872-9311; for all others it is 703-872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SJB' with a flourish at the end.

Steven Bos  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1754